

Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 USNATO 10084 01 OF 04 192016Z
ACTION ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 CIAE-00 DODE-00 NSAE-00
NSCE-00 SSO-00 USIE-00 INRE-00 H-01 INR-07 IO-13
L-03 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05 PRS-01 SP-02
SS-15 TRSE-00 DHA-05 CU-04 /085 W
-----125611 192059Z /75

O 191950Z OCT 77
FM USMISSION USNATO
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 6632
SECDEF WASHDC
INFO AMEMBASSY BELGRADE PRIORITY
ALL NATO CAPITALS
USNMR SHAPE BE

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 01 OF 04 USNATO 10084

BELGRADE FOR USDEL CSCE

E.O. 11652: GDS
TAGS: CSCE, NATO
SUBJECT: CSCE/CBMS: OCTOBER 18 POLADS DISCUSSION OF
MOVEMENTS CBM

REFS: (A) STATE 249547 DTG 180156Z OCT 77, (B) STATE
250247 DTG 190028Z OCT 77, (C) STATE 197382 DTG 190041Z
AUG 77, (D) BELGRADE 7074 DTG 180954Z OCT 77

SUMMARY: AT THEIR OCTOBER 18 MEETING, POLADS ACCEPTED
REVISED US OPTION II AND OPTION I AS BASIS FOR
ACHIEVING ALLIED CONSENSUS ON MOVEMENTS CBM. WHILE
POLADS SUGGESTED SEVERAL CHANGES, THE ONLY CHANGE THAT
APPEARS ESSENTIAL FOR ACHIEVEMENT OF FINAL CONSENSUS IS
DELETION OF PROVISION FOR NOTIFICATION OF FRONTIER
CROSSING MOVEMENTS. FRG REP SAID BONN WILL NOT ACCEPT
EVEN INDIRECT PROVISION FOR SUCH NOTIFICATION. OTHER
CHANGES RECOMMENDED BELOW WOULD HELP ACHIEVE PROMPT
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 USNATO 10084 01 OF 04 192016Z

AGREEMENT ON TEXT. ACTION REQUESTED: GUIDANCE IN TIME
FOR OCTOBER 25 POLADS MEETING. END SUMMARY.

1. AT THE OCTOBER 18 POLADS MEETING, US REP REVIEWED
FULLY REF A GUIDANCE ON MOVEMENTS CBM AND PROVIDED ALLIED
REPS WITH TEXTS AND COMMENTS ON REVISED OPTION II AND
OPTION I (PARAS 7-10 REF A WITH CORRECTION REF B).

2. DURING FIVE-HOUR DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS OF US TEXT, POLADS EXPRESSED APPRECIATION FOR US EFFORTS TO ACCOMMODATE THEIR VIEWS. ON A PERSONAL BASIS, THEY ACCEPTED US APPROACH AND REVISED OPTION II, WITH OPTION I AS A FALL-BACK, AS A BASIS FOR ATTEMPTING TO ACHIEVE ALLIED CONSENSUS ON MOVEMENTS CBM. NETHERLANDS REP RECALLED THAT THE ALLIES HAD BEEN CONSIDERING THE QUESTION OF MOVEMENTS CBM IN CSCE FOR SOME FOUR YEARS, STRESSED THAT THE US EFFORT TO MEET ALLIED DESIRES ON THIS ISSUE REPRESENTED A SUBSTANTIAL US MOVE, AND CAUTIONED OTHERS AGAINST ATTEMPTING TO MODIFY TOO EXTENSIVELY THE US PROPOSAL, WHICH HE WAS PREPARED TO RECOMMEND TO THE HAGUE AS A BASIS FOR ACHIEVING EARLY ALLIED AGREEMENT. THROUGHOUT THE DISCUSSION, US REP, SUPPORTED BY IMS REP, UNDERLINED THE ESSENTIALITY OF FULLY PROTECTING US AND NATO SECURITY INTERESTS IN AN ALLIED MOVEMENTS CBM FORMULATION, AND URGED OTHERS NOT TO PRESS NON-ESSENTIAL CHANGES THAT THEY CONSIDERED MIGHT BE PRESENTATIONALLY HELPFUL AT BELGRADE. ITALIAN REP, NOTING REPORT HE RECEIVED THAT CBMS DISCUSSION WOULD BEGIN IN BELGRADE OCTOBER 24, SAID THAT EARLY AGREEMENT AT NATO WAS NECESSARY IF ALLIES ARE TO HAVE A TEXT THEY CAN USE AT BELGRADE (REF D).

3. SEVERAL POLADS, AND PARTICULARLY THE UK REP, EXPRESSED CONCERN THAT US OPTION II WAS STILL TOO LONG
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 USNATO 10084 01 OF 04 192016Z

AND TOO COMPLEX TO GAIN DESIRED POLITICAL BENEFIT IF ADVANCED IN RESPONSE TO AN NNA PROPOSAL. THEIR CONCERN ABOUT THE LENGTH WAS MOTIVATED IN PART BY THE FACT THAT THEY HAD NOT PREVIOUSLY EXAMINED, JUXTAPOSED IN A SINGLE TEXT, US OPTION II TOGETHER WITH CAVEAT LANGUAGE (PARA 5 REF C) AND DEFINITIONS OF THE APPLICABLE AREA AND INFORMATION REQUESTED (PARA 27, REF C). THEY CONCEDED, AFTER US REP EXPLAINED HOW THE NEW FORMULATION OF OPTION II INCORPORATED THESE ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS IN ABBREVIATED FORM, THAT THE NEW TEXT WAS INDEED SHORTER THAN THE ORIGINAL US PROPOSAL.

4. THE FOLLOWING COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS, KEYED TO THE TEXT OF OPTION II IN REF A, REFLECT THE OUTCOME OF POLADS OCTOBER 18 DISCUSSION:

PARA (1) OF OPTION II: A FEW REPS, DESIRING BREVITY, URGED DELETION OF THIS PARA IN AN ALLIED COUNTER-PROPOSAL ON THE GROUNDS THAT IT WAS NOT ESSENTIAL. US AND IMS REPS ARGUED AGAINST DELETION SINCE THIS PARA WAS NECESSARY FOR COMPLETENESS AND CLARITY. RECOMMENDATION: OTHERS WILL NOT STICK ON THIS POINT. PARA SHOULD BE

RETAINED.

PARA (2) AND (3) OF OPTION II:

-- UK REP, SUPPORTED BY SOME OTHERS, URGED DELETION OF
PARA 3 AND INCLUSION IN PARA 2 OF A REFERENCE TO THE FINAL
ACT AS DEFINING THE APPLICABLE AREA. THE FIRST SENTENCE
OF PARA 2 WOULD THUS READ "NOTIFICATION WILL BE GIVEN OF
THE MOVEMENT INTO OR WITHIN THE APPLICABLE AREA, AS
DEFINED IN THE FINAL ACT, OF 25,000 OR MORE GROUND
TROOPS" ETC. RECOMMENDATION: ACCEPTANCE OF THIS
SUGGESTION. IT WOULD MEET ALLIED DESIRE FOR BREVITY
WITHOUT CHANGING THE SENSE OF OPTION II. IF GREATER
SPECIFICITY IS REQUIRED, REFERENCE COULD BE TO "AS DEFINED

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 USNATO 10084 02 OF 04 192025Z
ACTION ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 CIAE-00 DODE-00 NSAE-00
NSCE-00 SSO-00 USIE-00 INRE-00 H-01 INR-07 IO-13
L-03 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05 PRS-01 SP-02
SS-15 TRSE-00 DHA-05 CU-04 /085 W
-----125856 192101Z /75

O 191950Z OCT 77

FM USMISSION USNATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 6633

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO AMEMBASSY BELGRADE PRIORITY

ALL NATO CAPITALS

USNMR SHAPE BE

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 02 OF 04 USNATO 10084

FOR NOTIFICATION OF MAJOR MILITARY MANEUVERS IN THE FINAL
ACT" OR BY REFERENCE TO THE RELEVANT SECTION OF THE FINAL
ACT.

-- NORWEGIAN REP SAID HIS AUTHORITIES WISH TO KNOW WHETHER
"25,000 OR MORE GROUND TROOPS" COULD NOT BE REDUCED TO
PERHAPS 18,000 OR 20,000. US AND OTHERS OPPOSED AND FRENCH
REP AFFIRMED THAT 25,000 LEVEL WAS ESSENTIAL FOR HER
AUTHORITIES. RECOMMENDATION: NO CHANGE. NORWEGIAN REP
INDICATED HIS AUTHORITIES WOULD NOT INSIST ON THIS POINT,
BUT SAID THEY WOULD APPRECIATE ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENT WE
COULD PROVIDE IN RESPONSE TO THE NORWEGIAN QUERY.

-- UK AND TURKISH REPS SUGGESTED THAT "TROOPS" COULD BE

DEFINED BY BRIEF REFERENCE TO THE FINAL ACT PROVISIONS ON MAJOR MILITARY MANEUVERS. US REP, REVIEWING DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MANEUVERS AND MOVEMENTS AS EXPLAINED IN US INSTRUCTIONS, ARGUED STRONGLY AGAINST THIS MODIFICATION. RECOMMENDATION: NO CHANGE.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 USNATO 10084 02 OF 04 192025Z

-- AFTER CONSIDERABLE DISCUSSION, ALL REPS ACCEPTED "FOR A COORDINATED PURPOSE".

-- TURKISH REP URGED DELETION OF "FROM THE POINT OF ORIGIN" AND, EVEN MORE STRONGLY, DELETION OF "A STRAIGHT LINE DISTANCE". IMS REP SAID IMS COULD ACCEPT DELETION OF "A STRAIGHT LINE DISTANCE". US REP EXPLAINED THAT THESE ELEMENTS WERE ESSENTIAL. RECOMMENDATION: NO CHANGE.

-- TURKISH REP SAID HE WAS CERTAIN HIS AUTHORITIES COULD NOT ACCEPT PHRASE "OR FROM TERRITORY OUTSIDE THE APPLICABLE AREA TO TERRITORY WITHIN IT", SINCE SUCH PROVISION COULD REQUIRE NOTIFICATION OF MOVEMENTS ACROSS 250 KILOMETER LINE WITHIN TURKEY. HE NOTED THAT THE THRUST OF THIS PROVISION WOULD, IN ANY EVENT, APPEAR TO BE COVERED BY THE EARLIER PHRASE "MOVEMENT INTO OR WITHIN THE APPLICABLE AREA". RECOMMENDATION: TURKISH REP PRIVATELY CONFIRMED THAT HE FORESAW NO FLEXIBILITY ON THIS POINT. WE THEREFORE SUGGEST NOT ATTEMPTING TO USE THE PHRASE, TO WHICH THE TURKS OBJECT, IN ORDER TO MEET THE FRONTIER CROSSING PROBLEM, WHICH REMAINS UNRESOLVED.

-- FRG REP SAID HIS AUTHORITIES COULD NOT ACCEPT THE NETHERLANDS FORMULA "OR FROM THE TERRITORY OF ONE PARTICIPATING STATE IN EUROPE INTO THE TERRITORY OF ANOTHER". BELGIAN REP SAID HIS AUTHORITIES PREFERRED NOT INCLUDING FRONTIER-CROSSING PROVISION, ALTHOUGH THEY COULD ACCEPT IT WITH 25,000 TROOP LEVEL. EXTENSIVE DISCUSSION OF THIS PROBLEM INDICATED THAT OTHER REPS WILL LIKELY ACCEPT ANY FORMULATION ON WHICH THE US AND FRG CAN AGREE, PROVIDED IT DOES NOT ENTAIL ADDITIONAL PROBLEMS OF SORT NOTED BY THE TURKISH REP. SOME REPS URGED DELETION OF THE

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 USNATO 10084 02 OF 04 192025Z

"FRONTIER CROSSING" PROVISION SINCE, ALTHOUGH DESIRABLE IN A MOVEMENTS CBM AND IMPORTANT TO SOME NNAS, IT DID NOT APPEAR TO BE ESSENTIAL TO ALLIED SECURITY. US REP

REVIEWED GUIDANCE ON THIS POINT IN DETAIL, NOTED THAT SUCH PROVISION HAD BEEN AN INTEGRAL ELEMENT OF THE US PROPOSAL, BUT AGREED TO DISCUSS THE MATTER PRIVATELY WITH FRG REP. OTHERS URGED US AND FRG TO REACH PROMPT AGREEMENT.

IN SUBSEQUENT PRIVATE DISCUSSION FRG REP SAID THAT ANY ALTERNATIVE FORMULATION SUCH AS "MOVEMENTS BETWEEN PARTICIPATING STATES", SUGGESTED IN PARA 11 REF A, WOULD NOT BE ACCEPTABLE TO HIS AUTHORITIES, WHO OPPOSED ANY DIRECT OR INDIRECT REFERENCE TO FRONTIER CROSSING. FRG REP SAID HE HAD DISCUSSED THIS MATTER IN DETAIL WITH HIS AUTHORITIES, WHO REJECTED SEVERAL ALTERNATIVES HE PROPOSED TO THEM. WHILE FRG REP EARLIER BELIEVED THAT IT WAS THE SPECIFIC PHRASE "ACROSS AN INTERNATIONAL FRONTIER" TO WHICH BONN OBJECTED, HE NOW BELIEVED ANY FORMULATION IMPLYING THAT FRONTIER CROSSING MOVEMENTS SHOULD BE NOTIFIED WOULD NOT BE ACCEPTABLE TO BONN. THE CORE OF THE PROBLEM, HE BELIEVED, WAS A SECURITY CONCERN THAT, CONCEIVABLY, EVEN VERY SHORT MOVEMENTS OF ALLIED TROOPS INTO THE FRG, WHICH MIGHT BE DESIRABLE AT A TIME OF CRISIS, COULD BE COMPLICATED BY A NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT. SECONDLY, HIS AUTHORITIES WERE CONCERNED THAT SOME EIGHTY PERCENT OF ALLIED MOVEMENTS TO BE NOTIFIED WOULD BE MOVEMENTS ACROSS FRG FRONTIERS. BONN HAD NOTED IN THIS REGARD THAT THE EAST HAD NOT WELCOMED NOTIFICATION OF MANEUVERS AS EVIDENCE OF WESTERN GOOD INTENTIONS IN IMPLEMENTING THE FINAL ACT, BUT HAD RESPONDED WITH PROPAGANDA ACCUSATIONS ABOUT LARGE NUMBER OF ALLIED MANEUVERS. THE FRG DID NOT WISH TO HAVE THE

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 USNATO 10084 03 OF 04 192034Z
ACTION ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 CIAE-00 DODE-00 NSAE-00
NSCE-00 SSO-00 USIE-00 INRE-00 H-01 INR-07 IO-13
L-03 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05 PRS-01 SP-02
SS-15 TRSE-00 DHA-05 CU-04 /085 W
-----126089 192102Z /75

O 191950Z OCT 77

FM USMISSION USNATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 6634

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO AMEMBASSY BELGRADE PRIORITY

ALL NATO CAPITALS

USNMR SHAPE BE

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 03 OF 04 USNATO 10084

SAME EXPERIENCE IN NOTIFYING A LARGE NUMBER OF MOVEMENTS. BONN PREFERRED TO BEGIN MODESTLY ON MOVEMENTS, AND TO ASSESS ON THE BASIS OF EXPERIENCE WHETHER STRONGER PROVISIONS MIGHT BE DESIRABLE AT SOME FUTURE TIME. THIRDLY, FRG REP AGAIN NOTED BONN'S GENERAL DESIRE NOT TO STRESS FRONTIERS IN INTERNATIONAL UNDERTAKINGS. FRG REP MENTIONED THAT HE PERSONALLY BELIEVED BONN MIGHT ALSO BE CONCERNED THAT AN ALLIED PROPOSAL FOR A FRONTIER CROSSING NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT IN CSCE MIGHT BE CITED BY THE EAST AS A PRECEDENT IN REGARD TO STABILIZATION MEASURES IN MBFR. HOWEVER, HE HAD RECEIVED NO CONFIRMATION OF THIS CONCERN FROM BONN. FRG REP CONCLUDED THAT BONN BELIEVED THE ALLIED MOVEMENT CBM COUNTER-PROPOSAL SHOULD BE ADVANCED AT BELGRADE WITHOUT A FRONTIER CROSSING PROVISION. BONN EXPECTED THE NNAS TO COME BACK WITH A PROPOSAL FOR SUCH A PROVISION, AND WOULD PREFER AT THAT POINT TO TEST THE EASTERN REACTION TO THE NNA PROPOSAL. BONN BELIEVED THE EAST WOULD REJECT IT. HOWEVER, IF THE EAST ACCEPTED IT AND IT PROVED ESSENTIAL TO A CONSENSUS AT BELGRADE, BONN WAS UNLIKELY TO HOLD OUT. US REP SAID CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 USNATO 10084 03 OF 04 192034Z

HE WOULD REPORT FRG VIEWS TO WASHINGTON, BUT AGAIN URGED FRG REP TO EXPLORE FURTHER WITH HIS AUTHORITIES POSSIBILITIES FOR INCREASED FLEXIBILITY ON THIS POINT. RECOMMENDATION: THAT WE BE AUTHORIZED TO DROP FRONTIER CROSSING PROVISION IF IT APPEARS, AT NEXT POLADS MEETING, THAT DELETION IS THE ONLY WAY TO ACHIEVE FRG ACCEPTANCE AND THUS CONSENSUS.

PARA (4) OF OPTION II

-- FRENCH REP, WHO EXPRESSED GENERAL SATISFACTION WITH THE REVISED US OPTION II, SAID HER AUTHORITIES WOULD PROBABLY INSIST ON SPECIFICATION OF "21 DAYS". RECOMMENDATION: THAT WE INCLUDE "21 DAYS", WHICH WAS IN THE ORIGINAL US FORMULATION. THE FRENCH APPEAR TO BE FIRMER ON SPECIFYING 21 DAYS THAN ARE THE CANADIANS ON DOTS BEFORE DAYS.

-- A NUMBER OF REPS, WHO HAD NOT EARLIER OBJECTED TO THE CAVEAT IN PARA 5 REF C, EXPRESSED CONCERN, ON SEEING THE CAVEAT AS AN INTEGRAL PART OF OPTION II. SOME ARGUED THAT IT WAS NOT NECESSARY. SOME ARGUED THAT LANGUAGE RELATING TO "MILITARY ACTIVITIES" WAS UNLIKELY TO DISCOURAGE THE SOVIETS FROM INVOKING THE EXCEPTION TO

DEAL WITH ANY SITUATIONS IN EASTERN EUROPE THAT THE SOVIETS FIND POLITICALLY THREATENING, AND THAT THIS EFFORT TO DISCOURAGE ABUSE UNNECESSARILY COMPLICATED THE CAVEAT. TURKISH REP EXPRESSED VIEW THAT THE US FORMULATION WAS MORE RESTRICTIVE THAN THE FINAL ACT PROVISION FOR SHORTER NOTIFICATION OF MANEUVERS SINCE THE US LANGUAGE PROVIDED NOT ONLY FOR "ADVANCE NOTIFICATION" BUT ALSO FOR EXPLAINING TO OTHER PARTICIPATING STATES THE REASONS FOR A SHORTER NOTIFICATION. TURKISH REP
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 USNATO 10084 03 OF 04 192034Z

BELIEVED THAT THE ESSENTIAL ALLIED SECURITY POSITION WOULD BE BETTER PROTECTED BY A PROVISION, ALONG THE LINES OF THAT CONTAINED IN FINAL ACT FOR MANEUVERS, I.E., "OR IN THE CASE OF A MOVEMENT ARRANGED AT SHORTER NOTICE AT THE EARLIEST POSSIBLE OPPORTUNITY PRIOR TO ITS STARTING DATE". US REP DREW FULLY ON US GUIDANCE ON THIS POINT. NEVERTHELESS, SEVERAL REPS APPEARED ATTRACTED TO THE ARGUMENTS THAT A BRIEF FORMULATION, AS SUGGESTED BY TURKISH REP, WOULD BE LESS INHIBITING FOR THE ALLIES, PROBABLY MORE ACCEPTABLE AT BELGRADE, AND PRESENTATION-ALLY MORE DESIRABLE. CANADIAN REP FAVORED DELETION OF THE CAVEAT, BUT APPRECIATED US EFFORT TO ACCOMMODATE CANADIAN SUGGESTION. RECOMMENDATION: WHILE OTHERS WILL ACCEPT THE US FORMULATION ON REF A ON THIS POINT, WE RECOMMEND CAREFUL CONSIDERATION OF ALLIED VIEWS.

-- NOTING US VIEWS AND BRACKETS ON PHRASE "OR FOR REASONS INVOLVING ITS OWN INTERNAL SECURITY", ITALIAN REP SAID HIS AUTHORITIES WOULD WISH THIS PHRASE DELETED SINCE THEY WOULD NOT WISH TO NOTIFY MOVEMENTS FOR INTERNAL SECURITY REASONS, AND THEIR CONCERNS WOULD BE MET BY 25,000 THRESHOLD. RECOMMENDATION: DELETE THIS PHRASE.

-- MOST REPS ARGUED AGAINST INCLUSION OF THE FINAL SENTENCE IN PARA 4 ON THE GROUNDS THAT (A) IT WAS SELF-EVIDENT THAT NO CSCE UNDERTAKING COULD DEROGATE FROM UN CHARTER RIGHTS(B)IF NECESSARY, THIS POINT COULD BE MET IN ALLIED STATEMENTS, AND (C) THE FINAL ACT ALREADY COVERED THIS POINT THROUGH NUMEROUS REFERENCES TO THE UN CHARTER. RECOMMENDATION: DELETION IN LIGHT OF ABOVE ARGUMENTS, EVEN THOUGH ALLIES WILL NOT STICK ON THIS POINT.

PARA (5) OF OPTION II

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 USNATO 10084 04 OF 04 192036Z
ACTION ACDA-12

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 CIAE-00 DODE-00 NSAE-00
NSCE-00 SSO-00 USIE-00 INRE-00 H-01 INR-07 IO-13
L-03 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05 PRS-01 SP-02
SS-15 TRSE-00 DHA-05 CU-04 /085 W
-----126180 192059Z /75

O 191950Z OCT 77

FM USMISSION USNATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 6635

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO AMEMBASSY BELGRADE PRIORITY

ALL NATO CAPITALS

USNMR SHAPE BE

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 04 OF 04 USNATO 10084

-- ALLIED REPS EXPRESSED SATISFACTION WITH
THIS PARA. UK AND FRG REPS URGED DELETION OF THE PHRASE
"DESIGNATION, IF ANY, AND THE". RECOMMENDATION: THIS
IS NOT AN IMPORTANT POINT, AND DELETION IS NOT NECESSARY
UNLESS WASHINGTON BELIEVES IT WOULD NOT ENTAIL ANY
ESSENTIAL LOSS IN THE INFORMATION PROVISION.

5. WHILE TIME DID NOT PERMIT DISCUSSION OF US OPTION I,
FRENCH REP AGAIN NOTED THAT HER AUTHORITIES WOULD
LIKELY REQUIRE A CLEAR SPECIFICATION OF 25,000 TROOP
LEVEL IN OPTION I. RECOMMENDATION: WE WOULD APPRECIATE
WASHINGTON'S VIEWS ON HOW TO ACCOMMODATE THE FRENCH ON
THIS POINT. IF THE FRENCH INSIST, THEY COULD COMPLICATE
ACHIEVEMENT OF FINAL CONSENSUS.

6. ACTION REQUESTED: GUIDANCE IN TIME FOR OCTOBER 25
POLADS MEETING. POLADS WILL ALSO MEET OCTOBER 21,
TO TAKE UP OTHER ITEMS ON AGENDA NOT COVERED AT
OCTOBER 18 MEETING. IF WASHINGTON DESIRES, WE COULD
PROVIDE FURTHER VIEWS ON MOVEMENT CBM ISSUE AT THAT TIME.
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 USNATO 10084 04 OF 04 192036Z

BENNETT

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01-Jan-1994 12:00:00 am
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: ALLIANCE, POLICIES, MISSILES, MILITARY CAPABILITIES
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Sent Date: 19-Oct-1977 12:00:00 am
Decaption Date: 01-Jan-1960 12:00:00 am
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 22 May 2009
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1977USNATO10084
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Expiration:
Film Number: D770384-0915
Format: TEL
From: USNATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1977/newtext/t19771040/aaaabion.tel
Line Count: 435
Litigation Code IDs:
Litigation Codes:
Litigation History:
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Message ID: 1529832b-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Office: ACTION ACDA
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 8
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: 77 STATE 249547, 77 STATE 97
Retention: 0
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 20-Oct-2004 12:00:00 am
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review Media Identifier:
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
SAS ID: 855151
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: CSCE/CBMS: OCTOBER 18 POLADS DISCUSSION OF MOVEMENTS CBM
TAGS: MPOL, CSCE, NATO
To: STATE DOD
Type: TE
vdkgvwkey: odbc://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS_Docs/1529832b-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Review Markings:
Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
22 May 2009
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 22 May 2009